



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/796,671

03/09/2004

Keith Edward Foley

600.1263

3017

23280

7590

11/15/2005

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10018

EXAMINER

HAMDAN, WASSEEM H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,671

Applicant(s)

FOLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Wasseem H. Hamdan

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435).

Regarding claim 1, Ueda et al. discloses a method for detecting a type of one of a plurality of devices attached to a graphics machine [Abstract, lines 1-6], each device being one of at least a first type and a second type [column 5, lines 6-18], the method comprising:

detecting at a controller [44 or 110; column 6, lines 33-35; 45-51; [column 5, lines 45-67; column 6, lines 1-7] the type of device attached to or to be attached to the machine [Abstract, lines 1-6; [column 5, lines 6-18], the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection [column 6, lines 55-56; 64-65; column 7, lines 48-50].

Regarding claim 2, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the device includes a type identifier, and an identifier reader can be connected to the controller [FIGS. 6-1 and 6-2; column 5, lines 50-52; column 6, lines 45-50].

Regarding claim 3, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the controller sends a control signal to the device as a function of the detection [column 6, lines 45-49].

Art Unit: 2854

Regarding claim 4, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the devices can be added or removed and replaced with other devices of other types [column 1, lines 23-24; column 11, lines 17-22].

Regarding claim 8, Ueda et al. discloses a graphics machine [column 1, lines 19-20] comprising:

a controller [44 or 110],

a first device connected to the controller [18 or 41; column 4, lines 24-26; column 5, lines 4-6; column 6, lines 45-47], the first device being categorizable as one of at least a first type and a second type, the controller detecting the type of the first device[[column 5, lines 6-18]; and

a memory accessible by the controller [112], the memory storing information regarding the first type and the second type [column 5, lines 6-18];

wherein the controller automatically adjusts the first device as a function of the information [column 6, lines 55-56; 64-65; column 7, lines 48-50].

Regarding claim 9, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the first device includes a type identifier, and the machine further comprises an identifier reader connected to the controller [FIGS. 6-1 and 6-2; column 5, lines 50-52; column 6, lines 45-50].

Regarding claim 11, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the information is stored as a table [column 7, lines 2-15].

Regarding claim 12, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the first device is connected to the controller via an electrical plug, a fixed transmission line or a wireless connection [18; 41; FIG. 6-1; FIG. 2].

Regarding claim 13, Ueda et al. discloses the graphics machine includes a second device connected to the controller, the second device being one of the first type and the second type [column 5, lines 6-18].

Regarding claim 14, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the first device is modular [18 or 41; column 4, lines 24-26; column 5, lines 4-6; column 6, lines 45-47. According to the Chambers Dictionary of Science and Technology, published in 1999, page 751, the definition for “modular is (Electronics) Form of construction in which units, often with differing function, are therefore quickly interchangeable”, which as set forth in the office action Ueda et al. discloses this claimed limitation].

Regarding claim 15, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the controller has a plurality of inputs, each input identifying a particular location of the machine [FIGS. 6-1 and 6-2; 18 or 41; column 4, lines 24-26; column 5, lines 4-6; column 6, lines 45-47].

Regarding claim 19, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the type identifier supplies a digital signal [column 12, line 36].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435) in view of Graushar et al. (US Patent 6,267,366 B1).

Regarding claim 5, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention except for devices are feeders for a binding line. Graushar et al. discloses devices are feeders for a binding line [10; column 2, lines 66-67; column 3, lines 7-15]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including devices are feeders for a binding line, since Graushar et al. teaches that having devices are feeders for a binding line would be beneficial for the purpose of producing books such as catalogues, magazines and the like.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435) in view of Isaac et al. (US Patent 5,483,893).

Regarding claim 6, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention except for the devices are printing press components. Isaac et al. discloses the devices are printing press components [FIG. 2; column 1, lines 6-11]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the

Art Unit: 2854

teachings of Ueda et al. by including that the devices are printing press components, since it would be beneficial for the purpose of providing a controlled printing press.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435) in view of Rothman (Pub. No.: US 2004/0111597 A1).

Regarding claim 7, Ueda et al. disclose the system's initialization [column 19, lines 21-36], but silent about determining which devices are connected to the machine during start up or turning on the system. However Rothman et al. discloses a self-test check upon each turn-on of the machine to determine which devices are connected to the machine [page 1, section [0014], lines 5-8]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including a self-test check upon each turn-on of the machine to determine which devices are connected to the machine, since Rothman et al. teaches having a self-test check upon each turn-on of the machine to determine which devices are connected to the machine would be beneficial for the purpose of alerting the user if one of the required devices is not connected [page 1, section [0014]].

7. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435) in view of Kikinis (US Patent 6,137,591).

Regarding claim 16, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about that the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin. However Kikinis discloses wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power

pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin [Fig. 6; Fig. 8; column 9, lines 44-52]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin, since having wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal.

Regarding claim 17, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor. However Kikinis discloses that the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor [189]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor, since Kikinis teaches that having wherein the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor would be beneficial for the purpose of regulating load to the power supply [Kikinis: column 9, lines 51-52].

Regarding claim 18, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being

Art Unit: 2854

determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin. However Kikinis discloses wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin [Fig. 6; Fig. 8; column 9, lines 44-52]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin, since having wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal, and hence controlling the subsystems or modulars.

8. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (US Patent 5,690,435) in view of Pepperl+Fuchs.

Please note with the broadest reasonable interpretation of claims 16-18 language, the examiner sees the benefit to show that it is very standard in the industry of testing or automation interface to have the pins as claimed in claims 16-18 as shown below the examination of claims 16-18 with another reference.

Regarding claims 16-18, Ueda et al. disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about the limitations as claimed in claims 16-18. However Pepperl+Fuchs discloses the claimed limitations of claims 16-18 [page 12, Figure 5.3]. It would have been

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ueda et al. by including the limitations of 16-18 as above, since it would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal, and hence controlling the subsystems or modulars.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant argues newly added arguments filed on 10/11/2005 have been fully considered but they are persuasive. The final rejection has been withdrawn and new office action has been applied as shown above. In order to expedite prosecution of the case, the examiner decided to explain more how with the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language, Ueda reads on the claim language. However it is important to state that Ueda et al. as anticipate the claim language of claim 1 as set forth in the office action. The examiner meant to say that the photodetector 40 produces a signal indicating the presence of the a reflecting plate and he signal is being send to the controller 44 (as the examiner pointed in the final office action column 5, lines 4-19 and column 6, lines 45-47), and the detecting unit including detector 40 identifying the species of printing ribbon i.e. single ribbon and multiple ribbons (which they are the first type and the second type) which they read on the claim language.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wasseem H. Hamdan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2166. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (first Friday off) 6:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2854


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wasseem H. Hamdan

November 11, 2005



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800